



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/663,378

09/17/2003

Steven A. Rogers

006389.00002

2690

22907 7590 04/01/2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

MERED, HABTE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/663,378	Applicant(s) ROGERS, STEVEN A.	
	Examiner HABTE MERED	Art Unit 2616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) HABTE MERED. (3) Steven Roger (Inventor).
 (2) Chi Pham, Aung Moe. (4) Bradley Wright (Attorney).

Date of Interview: 28 March 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: Power Point presentation odf invitation.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Klassen et al (US 6, 71, 137) and Barton et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0031144).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Inventor briefly discussed invention using an earlier prepared power point presentation along with a video demo. Applicant's Attorney pointed out what he perceives as shortcomings of the prior arts with respect to claims 1 and 37. Examiner also presented his view of the prior art and how it applies to claims 1 and 37. No conclusive agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aung S. Moe/
 SPE 2616

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required